DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 342 SP 031 693

AUTHOR Dottin, Erskine S.
TITLE Raising Proper Educational Questions in the House of Intellect.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 89
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at Rivers State University, Nigeria (April 19, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; *Cognitive Ability; *College Role; *Creative Thinking; *Educational Environment; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Intellectual Development; Self Actualization; Social Experience; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This presentation addresses the function of education and, in particular, teacher education. Focusing upon the institutions of higher education in Nigeria, questions are raised on the role of the college or university in producing educated persons. It is pointed out that schools of higher education have a responsibility to be aware that educational curricula developed for oppressed peoples by the oppressor are not conducive to enhancing independence and self-actualization. A call is issued for developing the ability to think creatively and to judge critically. A sense of autonomy is emphasized as being necessary for developing responsible awareness of community and liberty. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313342

RAISING PROPER EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF INTELLECT

by

Erskine S. Dottin, Ph.D
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32514

Fulbright Lecturer
Rivers State University
of Science & Technology
Nkpolu, Port Harcourt
Nigeria
September 1988-July 1989

A Fulbright Lecture delivered to the university community at Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Wednesday, April 19, 1989.

SP 031 693

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Dottin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

He who sets the definition is in power
- Stokeley Carmichael

The absence of freedom imposes restraint on my deliberations as to what I shall do, where I shall live or the kind of task I shall pursue. I am robbed of the basic quality of manness. When I cannot choose what I shall do or where I shall live, it means in fact that someone or some system has already made these decisions for me, and I am reduced to an animal. Then the only resemblance I have to a man is in my motor responses and functions. I cannot adequately assume responsibility as a person because I have been made the victim of a decision in which I played no part

- The Late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

RAISING PROPER EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF INTELLECT

by

Erskine S. Dottin

INTRODUCTION

Ladies and gentlemen, I come before you today forewarned by the words of George Bernard Shaw: "There are two tragedies in life. One is not to get your heart's desire. The other is to get it."

My desire, as a recipient of an American Fulbright Award, to engage you in intellectual diatribe, is tempered by my consideration of what it means to be educated. On the one hand, there are those driven by a Platonic mind-body duality, who construe the educated person as having a prodigious propensity for "book learning." I have found overwhelming evidence during my stay in Nigeria that such a view of the educated person permeates, to coin Jacques Barzun, the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect," that is, institutions of higher learning. When I read the works of your noted educational historian, Professor A. Babs Fafunwa, I see a direct connection between his description of "the good Nigerian citizen" between 1850 and 1960, and this perception of the Nigerian educated person:

> ... one who was African by blood, Christian by religion, and British or French in culture and

intellect. (Fafunwa, 1974, p. 71)

Nevertheless, I have also been haunted by Shaw's admonition "to never let schooling get in the way of one's education." As a result, my proclivity is to side with the eminent person who pronounced that "the mark of an educated person is not his/her ability to answer questions, but his/her ability to raise proper questions."

The difference in the two perceptions of the educated person is well elucidated by Dr. Henry Carr, the famous Nigerian educator and administrator who accompanied the members of the famous Phelps-Stokes Commission during the early 1920s in Nigeria. He observed then that:

> The problem here is to get the scholars to be taught to think, and how to get our teachers to realize the fact that information is the least part of our education, that our true aim in education is not to produce a stock of facts, but to develop a certain habit of mind and a certain type of character. (Quoted in A. Babs Fafunwa, 1974, p. 121)

At my home institution in the United States, the University of West Florida in Pensacola, Florida, I ply my professional wares in teacher education. The questions I raise today will therefore be framed within the education context.

Of course, as in all human endeavors, there is always precedent. Consequently, more able persons than I have raised proper and more propitious questions previously. For example, the American humanistic psychologist, Dr. Carl Rogers, raises his questions in the American journal, The Educational Forum of Winter 1987, under the title, "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher." While he focused on his responsibilities for the learnings of a group of children, I would like to remain more generic in my thinking about education.

THE FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

One of my favorite authors, J. Krishnamurti, helps me to raise my first set of proper questions. Writing in his book, Think on These Things, he asks:

> Why do we go to school, why do we learn various subjects, why do we pass examinations and compete with each other for better grades? What does this so-called education mean, and what is it all about? (p. 9)

To Krishnamurti, this should be a very important question, "...not only for the students, but also for the parents, for the teachers, and for everyone who loves this earth." (p. 9)

Like Krishnamurti, I also want to ask whether education has any meaning unless it helps one "...to understand the

vast expanse of life with all its subtleties, with its extraordinary beauty, its sorrows and joys." (p.9)

I have a distinct feeling that some at UniTech might conclude that the function of education is to help one to prepare for and pass examinations and become very proficient in mathematics, physics, engineering, biology, or what you will, and get a job. But isn't that only a small corner of life?

According to Krishnamurti:

> Life is the poor and the rich; life is the constant battle between groups, races and nations; life is meditation; life is what we call religion, and it is also the subtle, hidden things of the mind - the envies, the ambitions, the passions, the fears, fulfilments and anxieties. All this and much more is life. (p. 10)

Could the function of education, therefore, be to cultivate in us the intelligence to try and find the answers to life's problems? Of course, to some, the term intelligence conjures up the California Stanford-Binet formula of MA/CA x 100= intelligence quotient. To others, the term may conjure up the acronym M.I.N.D. which according to Guy Claxton in his book, Living and Learning, means "the mechanism for integrating needs and desires."

But suppose we perceive intelligence as the "capacity ... to think freely without fear, without a formula, so that you begin to discover for yourself what is real, what is

true," (Krishnamurti, 1964, p. 11) then, any atmosphere/environment that induces fear is antithetical to the cultivation of this form of intelligence.

For example, as a participant-observer in the Year IV Student Projects in the Faculty of Technical and Science Education, I am moved to raise the question regarding whether the purpose of the project's exercise is to cultivate intelligence or to induce fear? I notice that students are afraid of their own thoughts less they are not sanctioned by authoritative pedagogues. One student took her **survey/questionnaire to a lecturer here at UST in another** faculty. He refused to complete it; excoriated her for what he contended was her inability to produce a correct questionnaire. Did he help to cultivate intelligence for the student? No! He induced fear. Rather than assisting by offering simple suggestions, the lecturer has induced the schooling dictum that things are either right or wrong: and one should always fear being told that one is wrong. Rather than inducing the student to engage in "the play of the random," - the playground of creativity - the lecturer has induced anxiety over learning being error free.

I also notice that students working on their Year IV Projects will try to solicit instructional advice from different lecturers surreptitiously. Rather than just simply seeking a second opinion about an idea, as is expected in the medical field, these students fear that openly sharing views will be painful for them in an atmosphere that fosters the notion that "all men are equal but some are more equal

than others." This schooling atmosphere becomes one in which students try to get advice from some people, and then prevaricate about that advice to others. Those who give the advice cryptically conceal their involvement in giving the advice. The outcome of the game is a kind of surreal one upsmanship. In such an atmosphere is intelligence being cultivated or is anxiety and fear being bred?

Education in this context seems not intended to produce literacy for freedom (Bowers, 1974; Greene, 1982) in the masses, i.e., education for critical consciousness, but instead seems to be a form of what Paulo Freire calls "pedagogy of the oppressed," and what the American scholar, Joel Spring calls "the sorting machine."

Social existence and social reality in this context become a mad, confused struggle by all to arrive at a safe place, a position of power or comfort. (Krishnamurti, 1964) Now is it, asks Krishnamurti, the function of education merely to help one to conform to the pattern of such a rotten social reality? Or is it to give one freedom - complete freedom to grow and create a different society, a new world? (Krishnamurti, 1964). Marilyn Fergusson, author of The Aquarian Conspiracy, offers a poignant point: "Ultimately, every human being wants to feel there is some inner and deeper meaning to his existence than just being and consuming and once he begins to feel that way, he wants his social organization to correspond to that feeling."

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, American sociologists, contend that social relations are to a large degree controlled by social structures or social orders.

They further posit that an individual comes to know self through a social consciousness which is shaped by the norms, values, beliefs and expectations of the social order. (Berger & Luckmann, 1967)

When these norms, beliefs, and so on, of the social structures are taken for granted and not examined, or are made to appear as the only reality, a form of "bad faith" according to Jean-Paul Sartre, then individual selves may be merely a reflection of the social order and social definition, rather than individual authentic selves.

Does the schooling enterprise or educational order facilitate this taken-for-granted world view by helping one to conform to the pattern of the status-quo through its norms, values, curricular content, social structure and the production and consumption knowledge process?

The person who simply conforms, who follows things the way there are, does not constantly inquire, does not constantly observe, does not constantly learn is not constantly aware, and thus may not constantly be educated.

Should developing countries, especially those like Nigeria that were under colonial rule, and are struggling to restructure their educational systems, systems intended to produce what Albert Memmi (1965) calls "the colonized mind" pay attention to their conceptions of the educated person? Are they assisting people to understand life? Or are they facilitating mere proficiency in subject matter to serve national economic and political needs?

SHOULD SCHOOLS SERVE NATIONAL ECONOMIC NEEDS?

Raising proper questions in the "House of Intellect" offers the opportunity to inquire whether schools should serve national economic and political needs.

In the United States of America, there are many who would give an affirmative endorsement to the question. For example, James B. Hunt, Jr., a former governor of North Carolina, argues that students must learn skills that are necessary for the improvement of the American economy. This kind of economic prioritization of educational aims has contemporary precedent. The Soviets launching of their Sputnik satellite in the late 1950s became the reform catalyst for mathematical and scientific priorities in American schools.

The 1980s has brought Japan's technological advantages to the fore. Again a plethora of national reports have appeared in America demanding that economic reconstruction and growth be placed firmly in the driver's seat when it comes to reconsideration of educational objectives and curricular decisions. Some of these more famous reports include:

A Nation at risk by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983)

Action for excellence by the Education Commission of the States (1983)

Making the grade by the Twentieth Century Fund (1983)

Educating Americans for the 21st century by the National Science Foundation (1984)

A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century: A report of the Task Force on teaching as a profession by The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986)

While it obvious, to most, that schools, and in particular, public schools serve societal needs, the proper question to be raised in the "house of intellect" should be to what extent should the culture of the school be consciously shaped by general needs and by specific interests be they political, economic or ideological? Would we all be comfortable if the schools served specific interests similar to Plato's meritocratic Republic? What about serving interests similar to Russia's attempt to forge the "Soviet Man"? What about serving the interests of the economic reality of the free market?

Do schools in Nigeria serve economic and political needs? The 1981 document entitled, National Policy on Education, gives this response:

> Education in Nigeria is no more a private enterprise, but a huge Government venture that has witnessed a progressive evolution of Government's complete and dynamic intervention and active participation. The Federal Government of Nigeria has adopted education as an instrument par excellence for effecting national development. (p. 5)

The document further suggests that education is a tool by which government can achieve its national objectives, one

of which is "a great and dynamic economy." (National Policy on Education, 1981, p. 7)

In fact, Professor J.A. Aghenta of the University of Benin, writing in the 1988 special issue of the Nigerian Educational Research Association's journal, entitled, "Education and National Development," offers educational planning as the device through which education may be used as a tool in national development. The professor contends that "one of the objectives of educational planning is not to provide education for all those who need it for that sake but to ensure that the education given serves the needs of the individuals and the society." (Aghenta, 1988)

Professor Aghenta further suggests that:

> Educational planning ... is a cohesive force which is concerned with setting up of an effective national system of education for developing human resources who are to use their expertise to their best advantage to serve given national ends which can be social, political or economic. (Aghenta, 1988, p. 5)

In order to achieve the goal of "a great and dynamic economy," Professor Aghenta maintains that:

> Our educational system must be planned to produce individuals with appropriate skills, abilities, and competencies both mental and physical which must be relevant to the development of agriculture, mining, manufacturing, building construction, commerce, public utilities,

transportation and communication and services. (Aghenta, 1988, p. 9)

Given the present state of education in Nigeria, should educated persons in the "House of Intellect" be raising proper questions such as: Should schools in Nigeria be more responsive to national or local needs? Is the current emphasis on increased training in science and technology well-founded? Is it the duty of the schools to prepare young people to function specifically in a capitalist economic system? Should the school doors be open to any and all business interests desiring to lend assistance in the improvement process?

But there are some in the "House of Intellect" like the American foundations of education scholar, Joel Spring, who raise a simple counter question: "Should schools become increasingly captive to the profit-motive of business and industry?"

Spring argues that the major calls for educational reform in America in the 1980s; the demand for an increase in academic standards in the public schools, particularly in science and mathematics, are directly tied to business and economic interests to keep America competitive in foreign markets. In other words, schools are being geared to meet the needs of high technology. (Spring, 1976)

But, according to Spring, a tacit assumption in such policy is that societal economic problems are not caused by

problems inherent in an economic system but by problems in the development of human capital. He contends that there is no proof for the proposition. For Nigeria, Professor N.A. Nwagwu, University of Benin, phrases the question accordingly: "Is it the educational system that is hampering national development or is it the underdevelopment of the nation that is handicapping the educational system? (Nwagwu, 1988, p. 24)

Are schools in Nigeria being held captive to the maximal growth and consumption paradigm of the metaphysical free market concept of the Structural Adjustment Programme?

Listen to the complaint of a former economist of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development:

> ... The world market for technology is grossly imperfect and is dominated by multinational corporations. This means that prices for technological inputs do not tend to reflect true scarcities, but with free competition absent, are administratively determined in such a way that high monopoly profits are obtained... the acquisition of technology is subject to certain forms of restrictive business practices which prevent developing countries from benefiting optimally from actual transfer. (Long, 1979, p. 267)

Are Nigerian schools being held captive to an "indust-reality" which according to the eminent American futurist,

Alvin Toffler, is "supported by a second wave civilization theory of causality which made possible achievements in science and technology, on the one hand, but derogated or ignored what it could not quantify." (Toffler, 1981, pp. 98-115)

Professor Bedford Fubara raises a proper educational question from his "house of intellect" at UST:

> whether the various financial assistance [by the World Bank/IMF for structural adjustment programmes] were intended to be repaid ab initio or whether they were simply employed to maintain their markets in the developing countries since donor markets have been saturated a long time ago after the great depressions of the 1930s. (Fubara, 1988, p. 10)

Does foreign donor aid create and maintain markets for donors? Does donor assistance sustain the need for continued production, employment and favourable balance of payments? Are the needs of the aid recipient governments and populations being channelled to those products that are aid-sponsored under the illusion of concession? Is the cost to recipients political manipulation and need channelling? (Fubara, 1988)

If answers to the foregoing are in the affirmative, should Nigerian schools serve national, economic needs which are dictated by foreign market manipulation?

TEACHER EDUCATION/TRAINING

Permit me now to turn more specifically to that area within the "House of Intellect" that evokes nausea for some, and euphoria for others: I am referring to Teacher Education/Training.

The more perspicacious of you would have long been cognizant that teacher training was not considered fit for the "Houses of Intellect." In the USA, the 19th and early 20th century Normal Schools took care of pedagogical training. In Nigeria, from all indications, Missionary Schools filled the bill.

In fact, it was assumed in the USA that teacher education graduates would not fill leadership roles or positions, and that most of them according to Merle Borrowman "would remain in the classroom, teaching a curriculum prescribed by the board of education, through texts selected by that board or provided on a chance basis by parents, and according to methods suggested by master teachers or educational theorists, most of whom had been educated in the [houses of intellect] colleges." (Borrowman, 1965, p. 22)

Borrowman further illuminates the fact that teacher education in the early U.S. Normal Schools was not seen as a scholarly endeavor by pointing out that: "The Normal Schools ... recruited a class of students who had limited opportunities for advanced education elsewhere or for achievement in other professions than teaching." (Borrowman, 1965, p. 22)

The Latin etymology of the word pedagogy thus has given solace to a long held academic view that "he who can does, he who cannot teaches" (Bernard Shaw, Maxims for Revolutionists) In fact, H.L. Mencken, raises the pedagogical question this way: "The average schoolmaster is and always must be essentially an ass, for how can one imagine an intelligent man engaging in so puerile an avocation?

The vocational priority given to the embryonic and early teacher education both in the USA and in Nigeria (Okafor, 1971) has fueled the long standing hostility on the part of traditional academic university faculty toward what they perceive as vocational education:

> When Western education was first introduced [in Nigeria] it was mainly literary: Although attempts were subsequently made to bring vocational subjects into school curricula, these had met with little success. Literary tradition and the university degree had become symbols of prestige, and technology, agriculture and other more practical undertakings, especially at the sub-professional level, had not been very popular. (Okafor, 1971, p. 107)

Is this academic "ivory tower" disdain for things practical and vocational an excuse to maintain class privileges for "the elite" - the elite similar to those being promulgated by President Babangida as the nefarious architects of Nigerian ills?

Francis F. Fuller and Oliver H. Bown, writing in Teacher Education, the 1975 edition of the U.S. National Society for the Study of Education, offered evidence that most American teacher educators share humble social-class origins and low status in comparison with their academic colleagues. According to Fuller and Bown (1975) teacher educators more often hold paying jobs while working for a degree, enter the faculty later, perhaps with the Ed.D; and so are less likely to have acquired the scholarly credentials valued by academicians, Has there been any definitive look at the profile of Nigerian teacher educators?

The sociologist, Ralph Turner, suggests that the accepted mode of upward social mobility shapes the school system directly, and indirectly, through its effects on the values which implement social control. Accordingly, he contends that the only conceptual difference between the English and American systems of social control and education is a form of "contest mobility" on the American side in which elite status is the prize in an open contest and is taken by the aspirants' own efforts; and a form of "sponsored mobility" on the English side in which elite recruits are chosen by elites or their agents; elite status is given on the basis of supported merit, and cannot be taken by any amount of effort. (Turner, 1960)

"Sponsored Mobility" systems of schooling as delineated by Turner facilitates a subtle class distinction which is maintained by an educated elite showing profound affinity

for esoteric intellectual disciplines, and little concern for things that are practical: such things which are common to the uneducated masses and who by their innate and congenital nature are not supposed to be disposed to things intellectual.

Should there be surprise in the "House of Intellect" to find a tradition of polemic and vitriolic works by academicians who attack the work and intelligence of professors of education? (See the work of Arthur Bestor, 1956; James Koerner, 1963; Francis Griffith, 1983 among others).

Myron Lieberman (1965) captures the cryptic struggle this way:

> In our ... colleges, the professors continue to croak 'vocationalism' at the idea of education courses even for teachers and to act as if a course is liberalizing only to the extent that it has nothing to do with man's work or his immediate problems. The schools of education have compounded the confusion by their insistence that every education course is 'professional.' Since all education courses are 'professional,' none is presumably a proper part of liberal education. The entire controversy over education courses is a remarkable illustration of the capacity of college professors to confuse words with things and institutions with ideas. Instead of regarding liberal education as an ideal and then evaluating

> courses according to their capacity to contribute to this ideal, professors have come to regard liberal education as something that can occur only in courses which are under the jurisdiction of [discipline specialists] .... There is no basis in theory or fact for this identification, it is purely gratuitous. Nevertheless, on most campuses, it has the force of Holy Writ. (Lieberman, 1965)

Of course, a tacit assumption in the "House of Intellect" is that education unlike the sciences, mathematics, history, english, and foreign languages, is not an intellectual discipline. But the ivy-league scholar Kimball (1986) contends that the study of education is a liberal discipline, and is no less historical and no more preprofessional than other disciplines. It addresses questions that are universal to human experiences, and these questions are thoroughly intellectual and have never been finally answered: What knowledge should be transmitted from generation to generation? How should it be transmitted? Why should it be transmitted at all?

The eminent mathematician and philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, warns:

> The antithesis between a technical and liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical [professional/vocational] education which is not liberal, and no liberal [academic] education which is not technical: that is, no education which does not impart both technique and

> intellectual vision. In simpler language, education should turn out the pupil with something he knows well and something he can do well. This intimate union of practice and theory aids both. The intellect does not work in a vacuum. The stimulation of creative impulse requires, ... the quick transition to practice. Geometry and mechanics, followed by workshop practice, gain that reality without which mathematics is verbiage.

It is no secret among students or professors devoted to excellence in teaching that undergraduate teaching in many if not most colleges and universities, is of very poor quality and understandably so. The only qualification a professor needs to teach is a Ph.D degree. Such a degree certifies only that a person has gained minimal knowledge and skill necessary to conduct research in his chosen academic field. With rare exceptions, a professor, has received no training in how to be an effective teacher.

Yet most "Houses of Intellect" maintain an arrangement in which academicians more or less oversee general education and the academic content for the teacher's teaching specialt, and teacher educators oversee pedagogy.

This bastardized arrangement in the "Houses of Intellect" in America and Nigeria have given succour to a perennial conflict between academicians and pedagogues.

Academicians like the former Harvard University President, James Conant, have asked, "isn't teaching an

intellectual activity requiring people of substantial intellectual accomplishment?" (Conant, 1963) His affirmative response led him to propose that all teacher candidates should be recruited [for the "House of Intellect"] from the upper-third of the graduating high school class on a national basis. (Conant, 1963) Other academicians like the philosopher, Mortimer Adler, have asked, "shouldn't a solid liberal arts education be the sole criterion for entry into teaching?" (Adler, 1982)

But a proper educational question to be raised here in the "House of Intellect" is why are many of the characteristics often associated with effective teachers, such as dispositions of caring, dedication, sensitivity, and so on, given so little attention in the consideration of teaching?

Some pedagogues have argued that to be regarded as professionals [public school] teachers must be in possession of some esoteric body of knowledge that sets them apart from laymen whose general education is equivalent to theirs or in some cases more extensive: the only esoteric body of knowledge available to distinguish the teacher from other well-educated people is that provided in professional education courses. This body of knowledge has historically centered around a few curriculum constants: educational foundations, educational psychology, educational methods, and an internship or student teaching.

But academicians in the "Houses of Intellect" have waged continuous warfare with the educationists (as academicians are wont to call teacher educators) over this knowledge base.

Some academicians like James Koerner contend that the professional education component in teacher education lacks credibility and academic validity:

> Education as an academic discipline has poor credentials. Relying on other fields, especially psychology for its principle substance, it has not yet developed a corpus of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope and power ... to be given full academic status. (Koerner, 1963, p. 17)

Others like James Conant question:

> (a) the necessity of the foundations of education courses which he claimed are academically eclectic, and have little relevance to students before they teach in schools. (Conant, 1963, p. 127)
>
> (b) the general methods courses which he contends assume the existence of an [invalid] body of predictive generalizations to be found wherever a teaching-learning situation exists, and which are unnecessary and duplicative of material already studied in subject matter areas. (Conant, 1963, p. 138)

Still others have demanded that general methods be replaced with subject matter oriented studies of teaching and learning. (Holmes Group, 1986; National Commision on Excellence in Education, 1983)

Some academicians have used the area of research to ask, what evidence is there that teacher education makes any difference in affecting the learning of students? Based on the results of empirical studies which compared liberal arts graduates and teacher education graduates on pedagogical tests, some advocate the implementation of (what is called in the USA - alternate certification) a process that would allow an individual with a bacalaureate degree in specified subject areas to teach in schools of the state without having to complete a teacher preparation program in the "House of Intellect."

Some pedagogues have responded by showing that there is now a science of education that is derived from studying life in the classroom, and this knowledge base should be the justification for professional studies in teacher education. (Berliner, 1984)

While the majority of my references and examples have been American oriented, my brief observation of conditions here at UST and in particular the Faculty of Technical & Science Education suggests that the bastardized model vis-a-vis pedagogues versus academicians is alive and well.

What is the perception held by members of other faculties at UST of the members of FTSE? Are they construed as academicians with a worthy place in the "House of Intellect," or simply necessary evils to be tolerated but not sanctioned? Is the feeling held by some academicians at UST that students who major in one of the other faculties, but who later transfer to education, are really intellectual

cast-offs who are better suited in the moronic education "boys quarters" of teacher education?

Will the National Universities Commission of Nigeria like its American accreditation counterpart, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, offer any solutions to resolve the internecine warfare in the "House of Intellect?" Or will their proposed Minimum Academic Standards for Education in the "House of Intellect" be simply viewed by the warring factions as:

(a) ambiguous standards that could not be applied uniformly.

(b) standards that ignore factors essential to the quality of teacher education programs.

(c) standards that are biased against certain types of institutions.

Can pedagogues themselves transcend the academic stigma thrust upon them by academicians in the "House of Intellect" and provide intellectual conceptualization to programs that presently are driven by organizational and programmatic mimmicking, behavioural modeling, and institutional muddling?

Should the "House of Intellect" continue to operate as a medieval guild or should it be a house of all the people in which one acquires certain understandings, skills and dispositions:

Shouldn't one, whether teacher educator or subject matter specialist, or engineer, acquire the following:

1. An understanding of the shared uses of human symbols, both technical and non-technical.

2. An understanding of shared membership in groups and institutions.

3. An understanding of shared producing and consuming.

4. An understanding of the shared relationship with nature.

5. An understanding of the shared sense of time.

6. An understanding of shared values and beliefs.

7. An understanding of the history of particular subject matter.

8. An understanding of some particular subject matter in depth and mastery.

9. An understanding of the theories in some particular subject matter field.

10. An understanding of some subject matter field's epistemology.

11. An understanding of some subject matter field's primary modes of inquiry.

12. An ability to read with understanding; write with clarity; listen and speak effectively; be proficient in the use of numbers; think critically; analyze educational policy and practice; solve educational problems; make instructional decisions; interact effectively with students, parents, colleagues, and the public; govern own daily activities and behavior on the basis of ethical and moral principles; participate in personal professional development ; participate in activities of a profession.

13. Be disposed to making responsible decisions; appreciating history and culture; examining values held in society and the way values are socially enforced; having a sense of aesthetic quality; a willingness to engage in frank

and searching discussion of the ethical and moral choices that confront us; developing a personal sense of scholarship in at least one field; developing a personal sense of scholarship to participate in professional associations, conferences, and other professional activities; exercising professional judgement and integrity.

Do persons in the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" want to produce effective human beings, i.e., to help Nigerians to be who they are? Then the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" will have to help the population sort out whether their ability to speak English well makes them Europeans, or whether cultural origins are critical to their understanding themselves, i.e., being real?

Persons in the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" should be cognizant that educational curricula developed for oppressed peoples by the oppressor is not conducive in enhancing the oppressed being who they are.

Do the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" help persons to participate fully in decisions that affect their lives? If so, the programmes offered must integrate schooling and work more closely in order to bring together theoretical training with the practice of living; and outcome of which is responsibility.

Do the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" help people to look for convergent or divergent answers to the issues facing the nation? If convergence is the focus, then the "Houses of Intellect" are inducing "maintenance learning" which is the acquisition of fixed outlooks, methods, and

rules for dealing with known and recurring situations. (Botkin, et al., 1979)

Do the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" assist people to be autonomous beings? Autonomy is the prerequisite of freedom; from it springs independence and self-fulfillment, and without it liberty is impossible. Autonomy derives from "the development of critical judgement."

Do those in the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" realize that without autonomy, a sense of community, that is, caring for others, is impossible, for the basis of community if the free association of autonomous individuals. Until persons are free and accept their responsibility, all attempts at community, within or without the "House of Intellect" are foredoomed.

Will the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" help their citizens toward self-liberation? Only through the free association of responsible individuals is community possible, and only through caring for others can autonomous individuals find completeness in the fellowship of a free society.

Will the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" provide the environment for an autonomous community to share with others? Sharing with others is a vital element of present day reality. However, most "houses of intellect" foster competition as the fundamental rule. Strength is realized from the linkage of parts. Competition does not reinforce, but lends itself to separation and frailness.

Will the Nigerian "Houses of Intellect" help us all to question a way of life which assures the most stock for the most cunning? Will they help humankind to transcend the

jungle way of life in order to share the common riches that cooperation and sharing with others foster?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR LETTING ME EXPERIENCE YOUR EXPERIENCE.

REFERENCES

Adler, M. (1982) The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Aghenta, J.A. (1988) "Educational planning and national development," in Education and national development (ed.) by E.T. Ehiametalor. Benin City: Nigerian Educational Research Association, 1-15.

Berger, P.L. & Luckmann, T. (1967) The social construction of reality. New York: Anchor Books.

Berliner, D.C. (1984) "Making changes in teacher education," Phi Delta Kappan, October.

Bestor, A. (1956) The restoration of learning. New York: Knopf.

Botkin, J.W., Mahdi, E., & Malitza, M. (1979) No limits to learning: Bridging the human gap. New York: Pergamon Press.

Borrowman, M.L. (1965) Teacher education in America: A documentary history. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bowers, C.A. (1974) Cultural literacy for freedom: An existential perspective on teaching, curriculum, and school policy. Oregon: Elan Publishers.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986) A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century: A report of the task force on teaching as a profession. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, May.

Claxton, G. (1980) Living and learning.

Cornett, L.M. (1984) "A comparison of teacher certification test scores and performance evaluations for graduates in teacher education and in arts and sciences in three southern states" Southern Regional Education Board.

Cruickshank, D.R. (1985) Models for the preparation of America's teachers. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Conant, J. (1963) The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dottin, E.S. (1982) "Education as literacy for freedom: Implications for Latin America and the Caribbean from an Upward Bound project." Paper presented at the Caribbean Studies Association's 7th annual conference, Kingston, Jamaica, May 25-29.

Fafunwa, A.B. (1974) History of eucation in Nigeria. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Fergusson, M. (1980) The aquarian conspiracy.

Freire, P. (1970) Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder & Herder.

Freire, P. (1973) Education for critical consciousness. New York: Seabury Press.

Fubara, B.A. (1988) "International monetary fund and the developing economies: In search of appropriate development aid policy for Nigeria. Paper delivered to the 1988 2 Airmobile Brigade Officers, October 12-14, 1988, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Fuller, F.F. & Bown, O.H. (1975) "Becoming a teacher," in Teacher Education edited by Kevin Ryan. 74th Yearbook of NSSE, pt. 2, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 29-30.

Gollnick, D.M. & Kunkel, R.C. (1968) "The reform of national accreditation," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 310-314.

Greene, M. (1982) "Literacy for what?" Phi Delta Kappan (63), 5, January, 326-329.

Griffith, F. (1983) "Teachers are part of the problem" American Education, October.

Holmes Group (1986) Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Kimball, B.A. (1986) "The training of teachers, the study of education and the liberal disciplines" Educational Theory, (36), 1, Winter, 15-21.

Koerner, J. (1963) The miseducation of American teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Krishnamurti, J. (1964) Think on these things.

Lieberman, M. (1965) Education as a profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Long, F. (1979) "The role of social scientific inquiry in technological transfer" American Journal of Economics and Sociology (38), 3, July.

Memmi, A. (1965) The colonizer and the colonized. Boston: Beacon Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1986) Standards procedures and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

National Universities Commission (1988) Proposed minimum academic standards for education. Lagos: NUC, August.

Nduka, O. (1975) Western education and the Nigerian cultural background. London: Oxford University Press.

Nwagwu, N.A. (1988) "Role of colleges of education in national development" in Education for national development (ed.) by E.T. Ehiametalor. Benin City: Nigerian Educational Research Association, 24-33.

Okafor, N. (1971) The development of universities in Nigeria. London: Longman.

Rogers, C.R. (1987) "Questions I would ask myself if I were a teacher," The Education Forum, (51), 2, Winter, 115-122.

Spring, J. (1976) The sorting machine: National educational policy since 1945. New York: David McKay.

Toffler, A. (1981) The third wave. New York: Bantam Books.

Turner, R. (1960) "Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system" in American Sociological Review, (25), 6, December, 855-867.